DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 910 SP 036 579

AUTHOR Rodriguez, Yvonne E.; Sjostrom, Barbara R.
TITLE Strategies for Teaching in a Culturally Responsive Manner.
PUB DATE 24 Feb 96
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (48th, Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Strategies; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Multicultural Education; Preschool Education; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Competencies; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Acceptance; Diversity (Student); Dominant Culture; Solidarity; Tolerance

ABSTRACT

This study examines how student teachers and teacher practitioners approach cultural diversity in their classrooms, teachers' underlying assumptions about teaching to diversity, and specific strategies used by teachers in their classrooms. The study tested the capacity of five culturally responsive pedagogy competencies to elicit specific strategies for implementing these competencies in elementary and secondary classroom settings across urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The competencies (monocultural perspective; acceptance; respect; tolerance; and affirmation, solidarity and critique) were analyzed across a multicultural framework. The analysis discerned the degree to which teachers demonstrated a propensity to use a culturally responsive (multicultural) or a monocultural approach in their teaching. Study participants were 45 randomly selected teachers distributed across all educational levels and types of settings. Of these, 38 volunteered to be interviewed by trained teacher candidates. Results indicated that participants used a preponderance of strategies in the monocultural level though strategies reflecting tolerance and acceptance appeared with more frequency. There was no evidence of teaching at the multicultural level of affirmation, solidarity or critique. Appendixes contain a description of the five culturally responsive competencies and an outline of the characteristics of multicultural education. (Contains 28 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 394 910

STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING IN A CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE MANNER

Paper presented at the
America ssociation of Colleges forTeacher Education
Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois
February 21-24, 1996

Dr. Yvonne E. Rodriguez **Dr. Barbara R. Sjostrom**

Rowan College of New Jersey
201 Mullica Hill Road
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

Office: (609) 256-4500
ext. 3807 or 3811

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Y Rodriguez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Areas of Specialization:
Pre-service Teacher Education;
Curriculum and Instruction;
Multicultural Education;
Bilingual/ESL Education;
Outcomes Assessment;
Management and Organization;
Urban Education;
Adult and Continuing Education.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP026579

STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING

IN A CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE MANNER

Teaching to and for diversity embodies an assumption on the part of the teacher that all knowledge is socially constructed. Not only is meaning mediated by the learner or knower but the perceived knowledge created by the learner is highly influenced by who they are. Teaching to and for diversity by definition is cooperative rather than competitive. This is teaching that is concerned with, and involved in student experiences as sources of knowledge. Addressing diversity in classroom settings mandates that the teacher utilize alternatives to traditional pedagogy. This can be accomplished by the creation of a culturally responsive pedagogy that is appropriate for the students in that particular classroom. The development of a culturally responsive pedagogy requires that the teacher search beyond traditional pedagogy which is mastery centered (Maher & Thompson Tetreaut, 1992) and grade centered. Using traditional pedagogies teachers and students equate educational success with the grades students receive, rather than the students' ability to foment meaning and cognitively mediate the knowledge. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) pointed to the fact that traditional pedagogical strategies geared at mastery learning separate rather than connect knowledge and learning. Traditional pedagogy compartmentalizes knowledge in two ways: (1) knowledge is packaged in discrete clusters; and (2) knowledge is isolated from the learner as an absolute entity whose purpose it is to assimilate the learner. "... students learn disciplinary content and methods of analysis on the terms of the dominant culture but forgo-especially in the case of women and minority students--a personal emergence that comes from connecting their education to their own experiences, or from raising and answering their own questions and concerns." (Maher & Thompson Tetreaut, 1992, p. 58). In an empirical study of classroom teaching behaviors,

Rodriguez and Sjostrom (1995) found that the selection of strategies by classroom teachers for the purpose of teaching to and for diversity acknowledges that classrooms have a culture and therefore, are not culturally neutral. Traditional pedagogy has promulgated classroom cultural neutrality as the academic norm. This frequently translates into teaching children in the same way or treating all children equally, instead of treating all children fairly or equitably, even if that means interacting with them differently.

In this study, teaching **to** diversity means addressing the diversity in classroom settings, in some measure for purposes of planning, instruction, and evaluation. For example, utilizing African American themes during February, National African-American History Month, as acknowledgement of the diversity represented in the United States. In contrast, teaching **for** diversity focuses on pluralism as a central theme of education and reality for the U.S. Society. In teaching **for** diversity instead of teaching about groups as isolated topics, a multicultural perspective of inclusion is the foundation of all planning, instruction and evaluation. Cultural resources are viewed as enrichment for cognitive development.

Teachers who examine their practice, and students outside the predominant culture, who have not been socialized into the traditional classroom culture are very much aware that classrooms have distinct cultures. They are also aware that **how** one teaches influences what is taught and what is learned. Acknowledging cultural diversity in classroom settings demonstrates appreciation of diversity in teacher education, as well as K-12 classrooms, and the society-at-large. Furthermore, it promotes the theme of addressing racism, discriminatory policies and practices, and utilizing models for maximizing the academic achievement of **all** students. In both contexts where teachers are teaching to or for diversity, they should have a mindset of respect for differences. The variations

that occur between those who teach to diversity and those who teach for it appear to be based on the degree to which they use a culturally responsive pedagogy and where they fall on the continuum of the multicultural education model. This ranges from monoculturalism to affirmation of multicultural education. The expected outcomes for implementing culturally responsive teaching will also influence whether one teaches to or for diversity. For example, teaching to diversity may be assimilationist in its underlying assumptions and goals; therefore, it may be used as a transitional technique which provides the learners with acceptance, role models, a sense of comfort or motivation. On the other hand, teaching for diversity may be pluralistic in its assumptions and goals and be used to promote participatory democracy for all members of society.

This paper will describe how student teachers and teacher practitioners approach cultural diversity in their classrooms. It will also describe how the researchers identified and documented the teachers' underlying assumptions about teaching to diversity, as well as the specific strategies utilized by teachers in their classrooms. The major contribution of this study is twofold: (1) methodological; and (2) pedagogical. First, we tested the capacity of five culturally responsive pedagogy competencies (Villegas, 1992) to elicit specific strategies for implementing said competencies in elementary and secondary classroom settings across urban, suburban and rural school districts. Then we analyzed the data collected using the five culturally responsive competencies across the levels of a multicultural framework (Nieto, 1992). The analysis indicated the degree to which the teachers interviewed demonstrated a propensity to utilize a culturally responsive (multicultural) or a monocultural approach in their teaching.

Theoretical Framework. Based on a comprehensive review of the multicultural education literature, Villegas (1991) developed a framework for analyzing and assessing cultural teaching

competence. (See Appendix 1.) In 1992, she described what teachers in a multicultural society should know and be able to do in order to function in today's classrooms. These included: (1) an attitude of respect for cultural differences, a belief that all students are capable of learning, and a sense of efficacy; (2) knowledge of the cultural resources their students possess and awareness of the culture of their own classrooms; (3) ability to implement an enriched curriculum for all students; (4) capability of building bridges between students' backgrounds and the teaching/learning process; and (5) awareness of cultural differences when evaluating students. The same year, Sonia Nieto (1992) identified four levels of attitudes and behaviors that educators can exhibit in multicultural education and one level in monocultural education. The five levels are: (1) monocultural perspective; (2) tolerance; (3) acceptance; (4) respect; and (5) affirmation, solidarity, and critique. (See Appendix 2.) Within a multicultural perspective, there are qualitative differences within strategies at particular levels as well as across levels . It is possible to have a pluralistic world view and teach to and for diversity. It is also possible to entertain diversity in isolated domains in one's teaching. The latter case would allow for teaching **to** diversity on a superficial level but not allow for teaching **for** diversity.

A cross referencing of these two theoretical models provides a classification of teacher behaviors which expands understanding of: (1) teaching to and for diversity; (2) culturally responsive pedagogy; and (3) a framework by which to assess our educational programs.

Educational Importance of the Study. The data verified that there are varying degrees of teaching to and for diversity among the teachers sampled. These range from a belief that there is a monocultural core that should be the norm in classrooms, to a belief that pluralism and diversity should be celebrated and included in classrooms (multiculturalism). The degrees, in turn, seem

representative of the levels of multicultural teaching in the Nieto model. Data from the five competencies verified that a culturally responsive pedagogy encompasses attitudinal, curricular, pedagogical and evaluative dimensions. The data also suggested that teachers who seemed to have a pluralistic mindset tended to embrace a culturally responsive pedagogy across the competencies. Moreover, these teachers tended to provide more specificity and complexity in the strategies they provided.

Data also indicated that it is a more complex process to teach at the levels of respect and affirmation of diversity than it is to teach at the level of tolerance and acceptance in classrooms. The findings signaled critical implications for teacher education. These include modeling teaching to diversity, curricular infusion, development of a professional language, emphasis on multiple perspectives for **all** learners, and practical experiences during the preservice professional preparation.

Sample. The study was conducted with a sample of public school teachers throughout the state of New Jersey. There was a fairly equal distribution of teachers working with children in urban, suburban, small town (not suburban), and rural school districts. In addition, family incomes ranged from lower to upper socio-economic status.

Forty-five study participants were randomly selected from among the teachers working in schools that were accessible to the interviewers. Of the forty-five identified, thirty-eight volunteered to be interviewed by pre-service teacher candidates from the elementary teacher education program of Rowan College of New Jersey. Early childhood, elementary, and middle school teachers comprised three-quarters of the sample. The remaining 25% of the sample were secondary education teachers. The majority (75%) ranged between 25-34 years of age, with an additional 15% under the age of 25 and 10% between the ages of 45 and 54 years. As is typical of national trends for gender

representation for teachers, more than 3/4 of the sample were female (82%). The racial composition is also representative with 83% of the sample being white, non-Hispanic, with the remainder consisting of 10% African-American and 7% Hispanic. The age distribution was expected since we limited the sample to teachers who had completed their teacher education program within the last 5 years or who were currently in a student teaching field placement. This decision was based on the fact that we sought to work with teachers who had received specific training in teaching to diversity in accordance with the current National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards. In terms of the sample's teaching preparation, 90% of the respondents had completed traditional teacher education programs. Most teachers had their training in southern New Jersey. Ten percent of the sample went through the alternate route program or a master of science in teaching program. Almost all of the teachers (95%) had completed bachelor's degrees, with 5% being teacher candidates in their last semester of their preparation and in their student teaching placement (pre-service teachers). Additionally, 25% were in the process of completing the master's degree and 5% had already completed a master's degree. The undergraduate educational degrees for sampled teachers revealed that almost 2/3 were trained as early childhood and/or elementary education teachers and 5% were initially trained as special education teachers. The remainder were educated for the secondary school curriculum in health and physical education and mathematics. The alternate route trained teachers and the master of science in teaching trained teachers were liberal arts majors in their initial degree programs.

In the reported teaching experiences, 55% had taught from three to six years. An additional 33% had one to two years teaching experience and the remainder, 12%, had seven to ten years or more experience in the classroom, some of which may have been as paraprofessionals or private

school teachers prior to completing their teacher preparation program.

Part of the demographic data gathering instrument asked questions on the teachers' perceptions of how well prepared they thought they were to deal with issues of diversity in their classroom teaching. When asked about their preparedness based on their pre-service training, 45% answered they felt "well prepared," 50% reported to be "somewhat prepared," and 5% answered "unprepared." These responses revealed teachers' perceptions about the kind of preparation they received concerning issues of diversity in their teacher education programs. When asked the same question based on school in-service training in dealing with diversity, the frequency of response was similar with 35% reporting "well prepared," 50% said "somewhat prepared," and 15% answered "unprepared."

Methodology. The data reported in this paper are part of a broader project that examined how teachers at various levels of experience address matters of diversity in planning curriculum, instruction, and evaluation. We used a survey and interviewing methodology with a primarily qualitative approach. The data were gathered by teacher candidates who were trained in the culturally responsive competencies and in interviewing and surveying techniques. There were two instruments used for data collection. The first instrument, developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) for Praxis III™: *Performance Assessment Series for the Beginning Teacher* (1992) is entitled *The Candidate Profile*. It elicited demographic information regarding gender, race, ethnicity, age, teaching setting, years of teaching, and educational preparation experiences with special focus on preparation for teaching to diversity. The second instrument was an interview protocol based on the five competencies (Villegas, 1992) related to culturally responsive pedagogy. The participants were asked to described specific strategies they used in teaching to diversity across the five competencies.

These descriptions were used to test the validity of the competencies in eliciting teaching strategies that are culturally responsive. In addition, the culturally responsive strategies provided were placed on a continuum across the five levels of multicultural education (Nieto, 1992) to determine the degree to which classroom teachers utilized a multicultural or monocultural approach in their teaching practice.

Data Analysis. The data analysis for this study comprises a two-fold content analysis. The first is an analysis of specific strategies reported by the study participants. The respondents classified their teaching practice for each of the five culturally responsive competencies (Villegas, 1991). We analyzed these strategies by competency in terms of frequency, relevance to competency, and specificity. The second analysis is a classification of the data by multicultural level (Nieto, 1992). This model includes a continuum of five levels: (1) monocultural education; (2) tolerance; (3) acceptance; (4) respect; and (5) affirmation, solidarity and critique. The analysis was done independently by each of the two researchers and then we compared the results, thus ensuring inter-rater reliability.

Findings and Discussion. The findings from this study are presented across the five culturally responsive competencies (Villegas, 1991). The strategies reported by the teachers were matched to the multicultural levels in the model put forth by Nieto (1992). Even though respondents were presented with an elaborate description of the culturally responsive pedagogies (refer to Appendix 1), explanations regarding teaching to diversity, and prompts for categories, there was a preponderance of strategies in the monocultural level. There appeared to be a discrepancy between the respondents' perceived level of preparation as reported in *The Candidate Profile* and the level of classroom strategies given on the interview protocol.

Certain culturally responsive teaching competencies generated more levels of analysis, complexity, and frequency than others. For example, multicultural curricular infusion and home-school communication were more freqently mentioned at the second level of multicultural education, the acceptance level. These culturally responsive strategies were reported by the teachers for competency three (enriched curriculum for all students) and competency four (building bridges between students' backgrounds and the instructional content/process), occurred more frequently and indicated a higher level of awareness of the importance of including multiple perspectives in the teaching/learning process.

The multicultural levels are not equidistant. It appears the knowledge base, attitudinal commitment to diversity, and skills required to teach at the monocultural and tolerance levels are less demanding than those necessary to teach at the upper levels of respect and affirmation. This was evident by the fact that more teachers were able to describe strategies that fell into the first two levels of the multicultural teaching model. At these levels, there were 107 strategies cited. While at the upper two levels of the Nieto model there were only 26 strategies cited and none were at the highest level of affirmation, solidarity and critique. One possible explanation may be that at the highest level, a strong institutional support may need to be operational. The issue of institutionalization for teaching at the affirmation level needs further study. These findings give support to the hierarchical nature of the multicultural education teaching model.

When all five competencies are aggregated into multicultural levels an interesting pattern emerges. On the surface, the monocultural level and the first two levels of multicultural education, (tolerance and acceptance) look similar in terms of frequency of strategies cited. However, a closer analysis reveals a marked qualitative difference among the strategies. The monocultural strategies

focussed on a lack of attention to student diversity. These strategies failed to acknowledge racism and/or discriminatory school practices and policies and did not take the learners' cultural background into account. In fact, diversity was perceived as a deficit and an obstacle to learning. An example of this perspective given for competency one (respect for cultural differences...) is "All students are encouraged equally to do their best work. We are also currently implementing a reinforcement program designed to foster positive behaviors and attitudes which are culturally universal." Another teacher included this statement in the response, "However, I have noticed that my students are culturally deprived." Both examples illustrate an assimilationist, monocultral perspective and lack of an attitudinal predisposition toward using a culturally responsive pedagogy.

Although tolerance is the second level of the multicultural education model, it is the beginning level of multicultural teaching. The tolerance level is characterized by policies and practices that challenge racism and discrimination. According to Nieto (1992), "Education is defined more expansively and includes attention to some important information about other groups." (p. 280). Some examples of the tolerance level are illustrated here for the culturally responsive competency three (enriching the curriculum...), "Teaching [about] the different ways that people from other cultures celebrate Christmas." Another strategy given was: "Cooking different foods from other cultures." These examples do challenge racism and discriminatory practices by including a multicultural perspective. However, they appear in isolated curricular topics and school activities which permit students and teachers to question the status quo and/or develop cultural awareness. Nevertheless, these strategies are sporadic and disconnected to the larger scope and sequence of the curriculum.

Teaching at the multicultural level of acceptance is markedly different from that of the

tolerance level. At the acceptance level, according to Nieto (1992), cultural differences are acknowledged in the existing school policies and practices. The curricular materials reflect some diversity of norms, lifestyles, and values of groups other than the dominant mainstream culture. Multicultural curriculum infusion is evident in course content. Students' experiences, cultures, and languages are used as resources for their learning. An example of teaching at the acceptance level in competency one (Respect for culture differences and a belief that all students are capable of learning...) is: "The respect that you [teachers] have for your classes' culture is shown in your lessons and through discussions with your class." For competency two, (awareness of cultural resources the students bring...) this quotation illustrates the acceptance teaching level: "Students are made conscious of the importance of respecting other ways of life, customs, and cultural backgrounds. Also, they are encouraged to take advantage of coming in contact with diverse people as an opportunity to enrich their cultural background." Yet another teacher said: "Students are given an opportunity to share information about their families, homes, lives. When we are studying a particular culture, students can bring in guests or cultural items." These strategies reveal more concrete examples as to how the students' experiences can be used as cultural resources for learning.

Table 1 on the following page presents the 190 strategies given by the teachers in the study for the five culturally responsive pedagogical competencies by multicultural education level. This is presented in a 5x5 table. The total number of strategies given by respondents is listed by teaching level and by percentage within a level of the multicultural model.

Table 1 - Number of Strategies Listed by Respondents for Five Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Competencies by Multicultural Level (n = 38)

Competencies	Levels by Respondent				
1. Demonstrates an attitude of respect for cultural differences, a belief that all students are capable of learning, and a sense of efficacy.	Monoculture 12	Tolerance 13	Acceptance 7	Respect 6	Affirmation 0
2. Is aware of cultural resources the students bring to the class and the culture of the classroom.	8	13	10	7	0
3. Implements an enriched curriculum for all students.	10	7	16	5	0
4. Builds bridges between students' back-grounds and the instructional content/process.	6	13	16	3	0
5. Is aware of cultural differences when evaluating students.	14	11	8	5	0
Totals:	50	57	57	26	0
Percentage of Total	26%	30%	30%	14%	0%

Minimum number of Strategies
n = 190

Of the 190 total number of strategies provided for culturally responsive teaching across the five teaching competencies, only 26 fell within the respect level of the multicultural education model as compared to 50, 57, and 57 strategies for monocultural, tolerance and acceptance levels respectively. This indicates that fewer of the respondents are teaching within the respect level. However, for those teaching within the respect level, culturally responsive practices were the

classroom norm. According to Nieto (1992), school policies at the respect level of multicultural education could include maintenance bilingual education programs and discussions about racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination, as well as heterogeneous grouping. In fact, at this level of teaching, ability grouping is not permitted by the school administration. Classrooms are safe and open environments where a pluralistic society is celebrated via course content that reflects the diversity of the larger society. Critical dialogue is central to classroom instructional interaction. Examples from the data at the respect level for competency three (Implement an enriched curriculum for all students) include the following: (1) "I chose culturally diversified literature recommended by our district. Our school is very positive toward diversity and makes every effort to provide us with such materials."; (2) "It is easy to incorporate an appreciation of others during history, language, and science. I know how I was taught and I try to expose my students to so much more."; and (3) "Using many methods ensures that every student gets to use his/her strengths. This, in turn, leads to a love of learning."

There was no evidence of teaching at the multicultural level of affirmation, solidarity or critique for any of the five culturally responsive pedagogy competencies across the 38 respondents. That constitutes an absence of strategies at this level from the pool of 190 strategies provided by the teachers in this study. This finding was unexpected since there has been a movement toward addressing and affirming diversity at all educational levels (K-16). This finding calls attention to a gap in educational practice.

Several respondents indicated that they felt there was no need for teachers to employ specific culturally responsive teaching strategies when evaluating students (competency five). For example, respondents stated: "I am aware of them [cultural differences when evaluating students] but I try not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to let them influence my judgement as much as possible, but it's always a factor," and "Due to the limited ethnic makeup of our district, there is little instance [sic] of cultural differences making real impact on student evaluation. Rather than cultural background, I find the attitude of parents plays a larger role." Another example provided was: "I use the same evaluation scale for all of my students." These examples suggest that respondents approach evaluating students as unidimensional and culture-free. They believe that competency five (being aware of cultural differences when evaluating students) is less relevant to their teaching than the other competencies. The responses related to evaluating students also demonstrate that these teachers are less inclined to evaluate in a culturally responsive manner than they are to plan and instruct that way. Up to the moment of evaluation, they appear more open to utilizing a culturally responsive pedagogy. In the words of one teacher: "That's [evaluation] where I cut the mustard."

Several of the responses for the evaluation competency indicated that the teachers viewed their students as homogeneously grouped in ability and therefore, felt no need for multiple measures in evaluation. This was particularly the case in predominantly white school settings. Evidence of these views follow: "I have no cultural differences in the class this year;" "My classroom is made up entirely of white students; I don't have students who speak different languages in my classroom;" and "I assure them [students] that there is plenty of time to complete tests, quizzes and reviews." These views do not acknowledge learning styles, ability or performance, gender, socio-economic status, and/or religious differences as cultural dimensions present in the classrooms. There was a marked contrast across multicultural levels for the competency related to evaluating students. It was ignored or stated to be irrelevant within the monocultural level, while cited as critical by teachers practicing in the various multicultural levels.

It appears that the culturally responsive pedagogy competency one (attitude of respect for cultural differences, a belief that all students are capable of learning, and a sense of efficacy) should be broken down into three distinct competencies. Several respondents addressed one or two parts of this competency but not the third. Consequently, there were more responses dealing with respect for cultural differences than there were for belief in the student's ability to learn and even fewer for the teacher's sense of efficacy.

Responses across all multicultural levels indicated that school districts have made an effort to include texts and curricular materials which present viewpoints beyond those of the core culture, particularly in the area of language arts and social studies. This inclusion provides a plausible explanation for the frequency of strategies provided by the teachers in this study, specifically for the competencies of enriching the curriculum for all students and building bridges between students' backgrounds and the instructional content.

The findings from this study, although not generalizable to the teaching force, provide empirical evidence to support the theoretical framework underlying culturally responsive pedagogy. The data also provided specific culturally responsive strategies utilized by teachers in actual classroom settings. Finally, the data indicated the degree to which the teachers interviewed demonstrated a propensity to utilize a monocultural or multicultural approach in their teaching practice.

Implications of the Study for Teacher Education. The study findings reveal a need for the restructuring of teacher education programs in order to infuse culturally responsive pedagogy throughout their curricula. The data showed that teachers perceive themselves as finished products when it come to addressing diversity issues in their teaching practice. Although, not one teacher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

stated strategies at the affirmation level of multicultural education, 95% of all respondents said they felt "well prepared" or "somewhat prepared" to deal with issues of diversity. Only 5% of the respondents said they felt "unprepared." Specific culturally responsive strategies across the various multicultural levels of teaching need to be identified, described, modeled, and practiced especially in pre-service programs, but also in in-service programs.

Language and content associated with culturally responsive teaching need to be part of the knowledge base for beginning teachers. Several teachers confused the language of schemata theory for scaffolding new knowledge with building bridges between students' cultural backgrounds and the instructional content/process. A substantial number of teachers responded to this competency within the schemata building notion, rather than that of teaching **to** and **for** diversity.Teacher education programs need to be accountable for acknowledging, including, describing and modeling the knowledge base for teaching **to** and **for** diversity across the curriculum. To this end, curricular materials and textbooks used in teacher education programs should have multiple perspectives and multiculturalism as a central organizing theme rather than as topics added into existing courses. A one-course approach is insufficient to counter-balance the assumptions teacher candidates and novice teachers have internalized from the mainstream culture regarding difference and how to teach in a culturally diverse society. Having teacher candidates work with children of diversified backgrounds prior to entering the teaching profession will assist them in internalizing the paradigm for teaching in a culturally responsive manner. Field placements such as student teaching and internships in multicultural settings should further the goal of operationalizing multicultural education.

Teacher education programs need to employ and model alternative, comprehensive and multi-faceted evaluation strategies. When culturally responsive evaluation strategies (e.g. portfolios

and performance-based activities) are built into the teacher education curriculum, they serve as a model for teacher candidates to replicate in their own classrooms.

Pre-service and in-service education programs need to emphasize that culturally responsive teaching and multicultural education are appropriate for all students because they foster multiple perspectives, critical thinking and cognitive mediation on the part of the learners. These are effective teaching practices which are at the center of our democratic principles of pluralism and civic participation. Therefore, they should be viewed as sound instructional practice rather than as a political agenda.

Bibliography

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1990). Teacher education pipeline II: Schools, colleges and departments of education enrollments by race and ethnicity. Washington, DC: Author.

Banks, J. (1991). Teaching multicultural literacy to teachers. Teaching Education, 4(1), 135-144.

Banks, J. (1987). The implications of multicultural education for teacher education. In F. Klassen and D. Gollnick (Eds.), Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies (pp.55-62). Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Belenke, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of the self, body, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Darling-Hammond, L. (November 1991). The implications of testing policy for quality and equality. Phi Delta Kappan, 220-225.

Delpit, L.D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Education Review. 58(3), 280-298.

Diaz, S., Moll, L.C., & Mehan, H. (1986). Sociocultural resources in instruction: A context-specific approach. Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students (pp. 187-230). California: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Dwyer, C.A., & Villegas, A.M. (August 1991). Guiding conception and assessment principles for The Praxis Series: Professional Assessment for Beginning Teachers. Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Educational Testing Service (1992). Praxis III Series. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Gollnick. D.M., & Chinn, P.C., Eds. (1994). Multicultural Education in a pluralistic society. New York: Merrill Publishing Company.

Heath, S.B. (1983a). Questioning at home and at school: A comparative study. In G. Spindler (Ed.), Doing ethnography: Educational anthropology in action (pp. 102-131). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Heath, S.B. (1983b). Ways with word: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms. London: Cambridge.

Hilliard, A. (1989). Teachers and cultural styles in a pluralistic society. NEA Today. 7. 65-69. instruction, Journal of Teacher Education, 33(1), 37-40.

Hood, S., & Parker, L. (1994). Minority students informing the faculty: Implications for racial diversity and the future of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, May-June, 45 (3), 164-171.

Laosa, L.M. (1977). Cognitive styles and learning strategies research: Some of the areas in which psychology can contribute to personalized instruction in multicultural education. Journal of Teacher Education, 28 (3), 26-30.

Maher, F., & Thompson Telreault, M.K. (1992). Inside feminist classrooms: An ethmographic approach. In L.L.B. Border and N. Van Note Chism (eds.) Teaching for Diversity: New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 49, 57-74. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nelson-Barber, S., & Meiei, T. (1990). Multicultural context a key factor in teaching. Academic Connections. New York: The College Board.

Nieto, S. (1992, 1996). Affirming divesity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Philips, S. (1983). The invisible culture: Communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. New York: Longman.

Putman, J., & Burke, B.J. (1992). Organizing and managing classroom learning communities. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Reynolds, M.C. (1989). Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher. New York: Pergamon Press for the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Rodriguez, Y.E. & Sjostrom, B.R. (1995). Culturally responsive teacher preparation evident in classroom approaches to cultural diversity: A novice and expereinced teacher. Journal of Teacher Education. September-October, 46 (4), 304-311.

Sleeter, C.E., & Grant, C.A. (1994). Making choices for multicultural education. New York: Merrill Publishing Company.

Stallings, J.A., & McCarthy, J. (1990). Teacher effectiveness research and equity issues. In H.P. Baptiste, Jr., H.C. Waxman, J.W. deFelix, & J.E. Anderson (Eds.), Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness (pp. 186-205). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Takaki, R. (1989). Strangers from a different shore. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.

Villegas, A.M. (1988). School failure and cultural mismatch: Another view. The Urban Review, 20(4), 253-265.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Villegas, A.M. (1991) Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond. Princeton, NJ: ETS.

Villegas, A.M. (1992). The competence needed by teachers in a multicultural society. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Education, Orlando, FL.

Appendix 1

CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PEDAGOGY
FIVE COMPETENCIES
WHAT TEACHERS MUST KNOW AND BE ABLE TO DO TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN A MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

Ana Maria Villegas

1. Teachers need to have an attitude of respects for cultural differences, a belief that all students are capable of learning, and a sense of efficacy.

> Respect for cultural differences

> Behavior of students must be understood in terms of norms of the community in which child is reared, not as deviations from the norms of the white middle class.

> Unfortunately, most educators (possibly including each of us) continue to hold a deficit mentality. "Differences" are often seen as deficiencies to be remedied.

> Teachers need to study the politics of differences--why are some differences more valued than others? Are some differences inherently superior? Is this notion of superiority socially imposed?

> Why should differences be respected in the educational process?

> As depicted in cognitive science research, learning entails a reconfigurating of what is already known and familiar to students.

> Instead of pouring information into empty or defective vessels, teachers must build on student's background experiences.

> When learning is viewed in this manner, student's cultural experiences must be seen as resources to be tapped rather than deficiencies to be corrected.

> Belief that all students are capable of learning

> Teacher expectations

> Sense of efficacy

> Accept responsibility for the learning of all students.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> If a lesson does not go well, teachers should not use student's background characteristics as excuses for ineffectiveness.

2. Teachers must know the cultural resources their students bring to class, and they must be aware of the culture of their own classroom.

> Students' cultural resources

> Cultural resources -- students' experiences, concepts, language skills, preferred interaction styles, approaches to learning...

> Teachers need to know students' cultural resources in order to build on these resources in the teaching-learning process.

> Although teachers need to know about their students' cultural resources, it would be unrealistic to expect them to have a detailed understanding of the numerous cultural groups in our society.

> A more productive strategy is to use a variety of procedures by which this information can be gained for students in their classes: making home visits, conferring with community members, talking with parents, consulting with minority teachers in the school, observing children both in and out of school.

> Move away from viewing culture as a list of static characteristics (which can easily degenerate into stereotypes).

> The culture of the classroom

> The classroom is not a neutral setting.

> Built into classroom life are cultural assumptions regarding: how learning is to be approached, how language is to be used, what evaluation means...

> Utility of the home-school incompatibility theory.

> For some students, the culture of the classroom is an extension of the culture (or way life is organized) of the home.

> For other students, however, the culture of the classroom often clashes with culture of their communities.

> Teachers must be helped to develop the skills needed to analyze the culture of their own classroom.

> Those entering the teaching profession should know that learning, whether in or out of school, occurs in a cultural context.

> Teachers must also understand that the cultural strategies they choose can clash with the way learning is approached by some students.

3. Teachers should implement an enriched curriculum for all students.

> Many children, especially minority students, tend to receive a watered down curriculum, one which emphasizes basic skills.

> All children need a challenging curriculum.

> This is not to say that drill and practice have no place in school.

> But an exclusive focus on basic skills is doomed to fail -- kids lose interest in activities that lack meaningful connections with life outside classrooms.

4. Teachers must build bridges between students' backgrounds and instructional content/process.

> Instructional content, materials, methods.

> If learning entails a reconfiguration of what is already known by students, then it must necessarily build on what is familiar to them.

> We need a curriculum of inclusion -- but this is not enough.

> Because today's student population is diverse, teachers must have a wide repertoire of instructional methods (direct instruction, approaches that give students control over their own learning).

5. Teachers should be aware of cultural differences when evaluating students.

> Students enter school with culturally-specific understanding of the appropriate means of displaying knowledge. If the teacher and the student do not share this understanding, it is likely that the teacher will misjudge the student's competence.

> Reliance on a single evaluation method is bound to set some students at a decided disadvantage in the classroom.

> Special attention must be given to the evaluation of students who are speakers of a language other than English.

Appendix 2 Levels of Multicultural Education

Monocultural Education	Characteristics of Multicultural Education	Tolerance
• Racism is unacknowledged. Policies and practices that support discrimination are left in place. These include low expectations and refusal to use students' natural resources (such as language and culture) in instruction. Only a sanitized and "safe" curriculum is in place.	**Antiracist/ Antidiscriminitory**	Policies and practices that challenge racism and discrim-ination are initiated. No overt signs of discrimination are acceptable (name-calling, graffiti, blatant racist and sexist textbooks or curriculum, etc.). ESL programs are in place for students who speak other languages.
• Defines education as the 3 R's and the "cannon." • "Cultural literacy" is understood within a mono-cultural framework. • All important knowledge is essentially European American. This Eurocentric view is reflected throughout the curriculum, instructional strategies, and environment for learning. • No attention is paid to student diversity.	**Basic** **Pervasive**	Education is defined more expansively and includes attention to some important information about other groups. A multicultural perspective is evident in some activities, such as Black History Month and Cinco de Mayo, and in some curriculum and materials. There may be an itinerant "multicultural teacher."
• Ethnic and/or women's studies, if available, are only for students from that group. This is a frill that is not important for other students to know.	**Important for All Students**	Ethnic and women's studies are only offered as isolated courses.
• Education supports the status quo. Thinking and acting are separate.	**Education for Social Justice**	Education is somewhat, although tenuously, linked to community projects and activities.
• Education is primarily content: who, what, where, when. The "great White men" version of history is propagated. Education is static.	**Process**	Education is both content and process. "Why" and "how" questions are tentatively broached.
• Education is domesticating. Reality is represented as static, finished, and flat.	**Critical Pedagogy**	Students and teachers begin to question the status quo.

Acceptance	Respect	Affirmation, Solidarity, and Critique
Policies and practices that acknowledge differences are in place. Textbooks reflect some diversity. Transitional bi-lingual programs are available. Curriculum is more inclusive of the histories and perspectives of a broader range of people.	Policies and practices that respect diversity are more evident, including maintenance bilingual education. Ability grouping is not permitted. Curriculum is more explicitly antiracist and honest. It is "safe" to talk about racism, sexism, and discrimination.	Policies and practices that affirm diversity and challenge racism are developed. There are high expectations for all students; students' language and culture are used in instruction and curriculum. Two-way bilingual programs are in place wherever possible. Everyone takes responsibility for racism and other forms of discrimination.
The diversity of lifestyles and values of groups other than the dominant one are acknowl-edged in some content, as can be seen in some courses and school activities.	Education is defined as that knowledge that is necessary for living in a complex and pluralistic society. As such, it includes much more content that is multicultural. Additive multiculturalism is the goal.	Basic education is multi-cultural education. All students learn to speak a second language and are familiar with a broad range of knowledge.
Student diversity is acknowl-edged, as can be seen not only in "Holidays and Heroes" but also in consideration of different learning styles, values, and languages. A "multicultural program" may be in place. Many students are expected to take part in curriculum that stresses diversity. A variety of languages is taught.	The learning environment is imbued with multicultural education. It can be seen in classroom interactions, materials, and the subculture of the school. All students take part in courses that reflect diversity. Teachers are involved in over-hauling the curriculum to be more open to such diversity.	Multicultural education pervades the curriculum, instructional strategies, and interactions among teachers, students, and the community. It can be seen everywhere: bulletin boards, the lunch room, assemblies. All courses are completely multicultural in essence. The curriculum for all students is enriched. Marginal students no longer exist.
The role of schools in social change is acknowledged. Some changes that reflect this attitude begin to be felt. Students take part in community service.	Students take part in community activities that reflect their social concerns.	The curriculum & instructional techniques are based on an understanding of social justice as central to education. Reflection and action are important components of learning.
Education is both content and process. "Why" and "how" questions are stressed more. Sensitivity and understanding of teachers toward their students are more evident.	Education is both content and process. Students and teachers begin to ask, "What if?" Teachers empathize with students and their families.	Education is an equal mix of content and process. It is dynamic. Teachers and students are empowered. Everyone in the school is becoming a multicultural person.
Students and teachers are beginning a dialogue. Students' experiences, cultures, and lan-guages are used as one source of their learning.	Students and teachers use critical dialogue as the primary basis for their education. They see and understand different perspectives.	Students and teachers are in-volved in a "subversive activity." Decision-making and social action skills are the basis of the curriculum.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE